

ion of the bread and wine was taken. For this practice precedent is found in the supper eaten by Jesus and the apostles on the eve of his arrest, on the occasion of the institution of the communion of the bread and wine. The 11th chapter of Paul's so called first letter to the Corinthians is mostly given up to the correction of abuses which arose in that church in connection with this matter of the love feast, on account of the fact that the rich and poor did not there surround a common table and partake of a common meal, but "each ate before the other his own supper, and one was hungry and another was drunken." Such modern scholars as Canon Farrar and Bishop Wescott contend that the supper Jesus ate with the apostles was not the Jewish Passover, but a new Christian passover, or supper which became the beginning of an institution new in spirit and purpose.

Finally, church history shows that it was the custom of the Apostolic and Post Apostolic churches to eat such a meal in connection with which they partook of the communion of the bread and wine. The Brethren church believes that this love feast was instituted by Christ and observed by the church in the days of its first love and zeal to teach symbolically the great doctrine of brotherly love. Even today nothing breaks down the false barriers of pride and social distinction between men, like sitting around a common meal. Witness, the banquets of college classes, and of political parties.

How much more effective then, when those who sit thus are bound together by the fact of a common salvation and inspired by a common purpose.

In John 13, an account is given of a proceeding which preceded the supper. It was the matter of Christ washing the feet of the disciples, which we studied in Sunday-school only last Sunday. The Brethren believe that Jesus did this to teach humility. But we also believe that he here instituted an ordinance, the observance of which would perpetually teach what he meant to teach there and then, that "he that will be greatest among you shall be servant of all."

In other words, it was intended to teach the disciples of all time that the genius of Jesus' life and teachings is not in accord with man's desire for selfish pre-eminence but a spirit of loving, unselfish service of others. Certainly, if those disciples needed the acted parable, the disciples of *today* need it. If the visible, tangible participation in this act was thought best by Christ to teach the apostles the great lessons of humility and service why is it not the best way to teach disciples the same lesson today, since, moreover, nineteen centuries of other methods have largely failed? We

believe that Christ's methods of teaching religious truth are peerless. We hold that Jesus said, and that after some sixty years John recorded these words in connection with this very act, "If I then your Lord and Master have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example that ye should do as I have done to you. Verily, verily, I say unto you, the servant is not greater than his lord, neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him. If ye know these things happy are ye if ye do them," with the intention that they should be literally obeyed.

That the primitive church so understood this act and these words of Christ is shown, we believe, (1) by the express language of St. John written so long after the church was organized in most parts of the Roman empire, and (2) from the reference made to the custom in I Tim. 5:10, where Paul gives as a qualification prerequisite to the reception of a widow into the number of those supported by the church, thus, "If she have washed the saints' feet." If this were simply a reference to a custom of ancient hospitality, why such explicit reference to the feet of the *saints*, rather than the feet of any guest? Certainly the church needs such an ordinance to teach the duty of a humble life of service for others. To teach this, to revive the Christ given ordinance, to embody in life what the ordinance teaches the Brethren church conceives it to be a part of her mission in the world.

In accordance with the principle above stated that the church should be like the apostolic church in its life, spirit and externals, the Brethren church teaches and practices the precept of Christ laid down in Matt. 5:39, "But I say unto you that ye resist not evil; but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." We believe this is applicable to men in every relation of life. Hence, we hold that the doctrine of non-resistance of evil here taught, logically entails the refusal of Christians to go to war, and when once obeyed by Christians will result in the abolition of war. This logic is substantiated by the fact that Jesus refused to allow Peter to use the sword in the Garden on the occasion of Christ's arrest—an occasion, if ever there was one, when violence would have been justified by the innocence of the one it sought to defend, and by the ruthless injustice of those on whom it was visited.

We believe the whole trend of Christ's teaching was against the barbarous, inhuman, yea, devilish institution called war. On Christ's trial before Pilate he said, "My kingdom is not of this world, else would my servants fight." He did not defend himself, but committed himself to him who judgeth righteously and

in whose hands was his whole life. We believe that "the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God," is the only weapon a Christian can bear.

Men are coming to see that war is a most inhuman, unreasonable and savage method of adjusting differences, very like to the ancient mode of settling private quarrels by the duel; or of deciding the innocence or guilt of an accused person by the ordeals of fire or of water.

We have long since seen the absurdity of the latter; we believe the time will come when war also will be considered as barbarous and as senseless as is the duel today. Of course cunning casuists who fear perplexity can propose difficulties; but so they can and do in every part of the domain of Christian ethics. Why can we not believe that non-resistance of evil will work as well in the case of nations as individuals.

Besides, there stand Christ's words uttered in that memorable Sermon on the Mount, to which the present civilization owes so much, and to which the future shall owe still more, saying, "It hath been said by them of old time, an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, but I say unto you, that ye resist not evil." There they will stand to rebuke self-willed men and nations, to inspire men and nations seeking to be Christ-like, until both shall so learn them that the dream of the prophets shall become a blessed reality, "and he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people; and they shall beat their swords into plow shares, and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

We also believe that it was not simply a Jewish fancy that possessed Matthew and James when they wrote words condemning the use of any sort of oath. Jesus said in the Sermon on the Mount, "Again ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, thou shalt not forswear (perjure) thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths; but I say unto you, swear not at all; neither by heaven for it is God's throne; nor by the earth, for it is his footstool; neither by Jerusalem, for it is the city of the great King; neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black, but let your communication be yea, yea; nay, nay; for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil." Matt. 5:33-38. And James 5:12, says "But above all things my brethren, swear not, neither by heaven, neither by the earth, neither by any other oath; but let your yea be yea and your nay, nay; lest ye fall into condemnation." We believe Jesus uttered the first of these two quotations and that James was almost literally quoting Christ in the second. And we believe